

Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology

Volume 52
Issue 1 *May-June*

Article 11

Summer 1961

The Importance of Training and Education in the Professionalization of Law Enforcement

George H. Brereton

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>



Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

George H. Brereton, The Importance of Training and Education in the Professionalization of Law Enforcement, 52 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 111 (1961)

This Criminology is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

POLICE SCIENCE

THE IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING AND EDUCATION IN THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT*

GEORGE H. BRERETON

George H. Brereton is Deputy Director, Department of Justice, for the State of California. Mr. Brereton has had wide experience in the law enforcement field, serving at one time with the Berkeley Police Department, subsequently as Director of the Police Training School, San Jose (California) State College, and with the California State Department of Education as First State Supervisor of Peace Officers' Training. Mr. Brereton has also served as Chief of the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation and as Assistant Director, Division of Criminal Law and Enforcement, Department of Justice, State of California. He has written extensively on law enforcement problems including earlier articles in this Journal.—EDITOR.

Anyone who has given any thought at all to the professionalization of law enforcement personnel, or to obtaining general recognition of law enforcement as a profession, will have to agree that one of the most important steps we must take in its accomplishment is the establishment of educational standards and training which are comparable to those which are found in many other "professions". This article is concerned primarily with this *one* phase of standards and qualifications which must be established and attained if we, in law enforcement, are to be recognized as a profession. However, I am in no way attempting to minimize other attributes and qualifications which we expect to find in, and must require of the true professional law enforcement officer. The intelligence, physical attributes, age, character, reputation, and personality are all important. "The qualities of integrity, honesty, justice, decency, benevolence, compassion, and all the other virtues we look for in wholesome leadership throughout the world are the same qualities that we desire to see represented throughout all of the police service."¹

But I cannot include these topics in this paper. I shall discuss only some of the highlights in the development of police education and training in the United States. I do this because of their inseparable and important relationship with pro-

fessionalization of the police service, and also because of the fact that no law enforcement agency today can function efficiently or effectively unless it includes high standards of education and training in its plans and operations.

In presenting this subject it will be necessary to single out certain individuals and law enforcement agencies, or schools and colleges, which influenced, in varying degrees of importance, the professionalization of law enforcement officers. In doing so I have no intention of either slighting or disparaging the influence or the activities of others who are not mentioned. Time has not permitted exhaustive research of this subject, nor is space available to permit me to name everyone who has participated in this activity.

The idea that it is necessary to have a well trained "career" or professional police officer is by no means a new one. This was recognized and put into practice at a very early date, both on the Continent of Europe and in England. For many years the various police departments in Europe have had extensive training programs for their police officers. Their "commissioned" officers, as distinguished from their non-commissioned officers, are educated in colleges and universities for a career in public service, or for the army, from which they are often recruited. These men make a career of the police service and are promoted through various ranks and sometimes are promoted from a small city to a larger city as opportunities are presented and their abilities are recognized.

Nor are the ideas of establishing minimum standards, selection, training, etc., any longer new or

* An address made to the Oregon-Washington Lawmen's Association, March 22, 1960, Salem, Oregon.

¹ DANIEL S. C. LEE, Chief of Police, Honolulu, Hawaii, Professional Standards of the Police Service, THE POLICE YEAR BOOK, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., 1959, pp. 169-170.

unique in the United States. They have been "old hat" for many years. The question which has perturbed me the most and which, I am sure has caused numerous other law enforcement officials great concern, is why it has taken so long for so many law enforcement officials, city, county, state legislators, and citizens, to recognize what is needed to improve law enforcement and to take the necessary steps to accomplish it. Certainly, it could not be from lack of knowledge of the problems since they have been enumerated, and, with suggested remedies, have been broadcast both orally and in written form for many years by outstanding students of government and law enforcement officials. Illustrative of what I mean is a statement, made in 1923 by August Vollmer, famous chief of police (now deceased) of Berkeley, California. With reference to police recruiting he said: "The first step in any plan to make our police departments more competent to control crime is *keeping out* rather than the *removal after they get in*—of undesirable, incompetent, and mentally or physically unfit persons from the police force . . . an unfit or incompetent policeman weakens the moral fiber of his associates and at the same time destroys the confidence of the public in the department. The protective organization suffers, and society always pays the bill when the 'policemen' of a community are dishonest, brutal, stupid, and physically or temperamentally unsuited to their work."²

Vollmer, who at the time of this statement was on a year's leave of absence from Berkeley, and was Chief of Police of Los Angeles, made seven recommendations which would in his opinion raise the standards and vastly improve the police departments of virtually every city in the United States. They were:

1. Establish and maintain higher standards of education, mental, moral and physical requirements for applicants.
2. Observation of all recruits by a medicopsychologist during their training period.
3. Withhold police authority from the recruit until he has proved by his conduct and his knowledge that he is fitted to discharge the duties of his position.
4. Establish preparatory and promotional courses for policemen in colleges and universities.

² AUGUST VOLLMER in DEARBORN INDEPENDENT, June 21, 1924, pp. 13-14, incl. (Italics added.)

5. Establish crime prevention divisions and appoint a trained criminologist to conduct the activities of the division.

6. Establish a merit system in police departments.

7. Educate the public and secure its friendship and cooperation with the police department.³

An additional recommendation which I will make, although it might be included in Vollmer's #6 recommendation, is that in order to obtain the very best personnel available in the city, county, or state:

Pay good salaries, provide adequate vacation, sickness and disability benefits and establish a sound and efficient pension and retirement system.

With respect to his fourth recommendation, it was because of his efforts that the University of California first established, in the summer session of 1916, a six week criminology and police course. This was "probably the first course designed for police training in a big university".⁴ I do not wish to imply, in quoting Chief Vollmer's statement, that no thought had been given by anyone else to police training or that police training programs had not been inaugurated prior to 1923. Such is not the case.

HIGHLIGHTS IN FORTY YEARS OF POLICE TRAINING

As early as 1906 a training school was established by the Pennsylvania State Police. In 1911 the Detroit Police Department established its training school for recruits to be followed a few years later by New York's Police Academy. In 1917 New York State Police established a training school for its troopers, which, in 1921 expanded its training activities so that any New York peace officer was allowed to enroll in the six week training course which was given each year during the months of January and February. In 1928 the New York training program was further extended by establishing zone or regional schools for local peace officers in nineteen zones into which the state was divided. In 1921 the New Jersey State Police established its training school, which a few years later, was made available to New Jersey peace officers, other than State Police. This was a three months school which was operated during the fall of each year.

³ Ibid.

⁴ MUNICIPAL POLICE ADMINISTRATION 4th Edition, 1954, International City Managers' Association, p. 210.

During this same period training schools were established by Michigan State Police and the Police Departments of Detroit, Louisville, Cincinnati, Portland (Oregon), Los Angeles, and Berkeley. They were considered by Munro "to stand out in their respective spheres", but with respect to the training schools of other departments "most of them (were) elementary compared to European schools".⁵ A more critical evaluation of local police training and of departmental training schools in the United States prior to 1931 is found in the Wickersham Report, named for George W. Wickersham, Chairman of the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement.

David G. Monroe says, as a result of a personal survey of 225 towns having less than 10,000 population, and 75 towns between 10,000 and 75,000, plus the information obtained from "questionnaires sent to all cities in the United States over 10,000 . . . there is absolutely nothing done which by any stretch of the imagination could be considered as police training" in the group below 10,000 population. "Not one of the cities had experience as a requirement for admission to the force, 216 never inquired if the prospective policeman could handle a gun, and 185 sent the man out on duty with no instruction and even without the aid and advice of an experienced man. Forty cities placed the beginner with an older man from periods of a night to one week."⁶

Out of the 383 cities who replied to the 745 questionnaires which were sent out "seventy-eight (about 20 per cent) reported some method of training. Of the 20 per cent having training, not more than 15 gave courses which could be considered to qualify the recruit as the possessor of a proper background for efficient work".⁷

Munroe, however, did mention, apparently with some favor, the programs of Jacksonville, Florida, and Portland, Oregon, (1931) which he reported, "...lays great stress on laws and ordinances with a further consideration of the conduct of the officer and a few specialized subjects"; the Detroit Police School where "each recruit is subject to a six week's course", and rated four schools, Louisville, New York, Cincinnati, and Berkeley, California, as "deserving a close scrutiny".⁸ After

reviewing the programs of the four cities just mentioned he states: "It immediately becomes obvious that the training made necessary by present-day conditions cannot be met by the old methods. In fact the ultimate goal is possible only through two means: *"State supported and controlled schools for police only; university cooperation"*.⁹ "Two new aspects of the work (training) have been recently developed in the university field, both widely divergent, but both offering splendid examples of the new trend of schooling." The first "is at Northwestern University, and is an intensive 4-week course" and the second "is the college course offered at San Jose (Calif.) State Teachers' College".¹⁰

In spite of the generally unsatisfactory state of police training reported in the Wickersham Report, possibly influenced by the report; probably influenced, at least in part by Vollmer, and a few other law enforcement officials, and students of government; possibly because of a growing realization on the part of law enforcement and other government officials that more attention had to be given to the careful selection and better training of peace officers if any success was to be attained in combating the increasing crime problems of the period; and probably due in no small measure to the influence of a new leader in law enforcement, John Edgar Hoover, who in 1924 was appointed Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in the twenty year period between 1920 and 1940 both interest and activity increased in all types of *in-service* and *pre-service* law enforcement training.

In 1927 the chiefs of police of Wisconsin asked the State University to organize some form of training for their officers. This program, which was provided by the Extension Division of the University of Wisconsin, was not pre-employment training, but was similar to the "zone" school system developed by the State Police in New York. However, this program was discontinued in 1931 when Dr. Barry accepted a position in Chicago as head of the Juvenile Detention Home.

"In 1929 the University of Chicago established the second type of police training. This was an entirely different system from the plan used in Wisconsin. August Vollmer, Chief of Police of Berkeley, California, was brought to the Univer-

⁵ MUNRO, W. B. MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION, Note 2, p. 166.

⁶ National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, REPORT ON POLICE, No. 14, June 26, 1931, p. 70.

⁷ Ibid., p. 71.

⁸ Ibid., p. 72.

⁹ Ibid., p. 79. (Italics added.)

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 83-84.

sity as Professor of Police Administration in the Political Science Department.

"The training as organized by Professor Vollmer was divided into two parts. In the Autumn quarter there was given a course on Police Administration which included the general principles of organization and control of police departments; various methods of selecting, training, and distributing the men, etc. Police Procedure was taught during the Winter quarter. This included lectures on criminal investigation, identification, etc. In addition to the above two courses, during each quarter a seminar was conducted two hours each week in which specific research projects were carried out by the students.

"Although the University of Chicago offered opportunities for the training of police officers already in departments, its *primary* aim was the training of college students interested in police administration. This program was different from that of the University of Wisconsin as it embodied the idea of eventually establishing police service and training on a professional status. It is, however, impossible to cover the entire police field in an intensive manner through the efforts of one instructor. Although it was a progressive development, the University of Chicago could not offer all the instruction which would be necessary to graduate a student well grounded in various phases of police work. This program was also discontinued in the spring of 1930 when Vollmer resigned and returned to his former position as chief of police at Berkeley."¹¹

Shortly after returning to Berkeley, August Vollmer accepted a professorship in police administration at the University of California. There under Professor Samuel May, Director of the Bureau of Public Administration, a program was inaugurated in 1931 where students were trained in the general field of public administration, "of which police courses constituted but one phase of their instruction . . . actual training in police work (at that time) . . . was restricted to one course of three hours per week" which was taught by Vollmer throughout the school year and "four hours of seminar work" covering police and other fields of public administration.¹²

While we are considering this period it should

¹¹ GEORGE H. BRERETON, *Police Training in College and University*, *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLICE SCIENCE*, Vol. 3, Jan.-Feb. 1932, No. 1, pp. 65-66.

¹² This program continued to grow and in 1950 a School of Criminology was established.

be mentioned that in the year 1929 the California State Legislature amended the act which had created the State Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation and made it the duty of the Board of Managers of the Bureau "to arrange for and organize schools at convenient centers for training peace officers".¹³ Although no *immediate* action resulted from this legislation, since no appropriation accompanied the enactment of the law, it does indicate the wide-spread interest of California law enforcement officers in the subject of training as this legislation was enacted at the request of the State Sheriffs' District Attorneys' and Peace Officers' Associations—it was in effect the "springboard" from which in 1935 the "California Plan for Peace Officer Training" was launched.

The establishment of the police program at the State College, San Jose, California on September 24, 1930, has already been mentioned, however it may be of interest to know that this was "... the first organized undergraduate program of training for prospective policemen".¹⁴

Between the years 1929 and 1931 the University of Southern California developed still another type of police training. Under Dean Emory E. Olson, of the School of Citizenship and Public Administration, a combination of extension and regular university courses were developed. In September 1929 the first "after hour" in-service police courses were taught at the University's Civic Center School to regularly employed peace officers. "Full time students first were in attendance on the main campus in 1930. Certificates were offered in 1931, bachelor's degrees in 1932, and master's in 1933".¹⁵ Here we find definite courses not only for meeting conditions of the present, but also with a view to the future in turning out men with a college education who have had instruction in the police field".¹⁶

During 1931-32 the Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory, which has been mentioned previously, gave, in each year, one-month courses in the scientific aspects of criminal investigation and identification, which were well prepared and well attended. However, as anyone will realize if they examine the courses which were offered, no student

¹³ CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE, Sec. 11008.

¹⁴ MUNICIPAL POLICE ADMINISTRATION, 4th Edition 1954, p. 210.

¹⁵ THE DAILY TROJAN, University of Southern California, June 16, 1939.

¹⁶ GEORGE H. BRERETON, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

who did not have extensive experience or considerable training in natural sciences, could do little more during the one-month session than obtain an appreciation of the value and of the problems involved in scientific crime detection.

During 1930-31 Willamette University, conducted a course of one week's duration for the police officers of the State of Oregon.¹⁷

Also in 1931 through the efforts of O. W. Wilson, then Chief of Police of Wichita, the Kansas League of Municipalities established a one-week training school at Wichita for the peace officers of Kansas. Although not connected with any educational institution, this school deserves mention for its well planned curricula, selection of instructors, and general management of accommodations for visiting officers.

In addition to those programs previously mentioned, in 1935 a well planned and well organized *pre-employment* training program was established at Michigan State College at East Lansing, Michigan, and in this same year the National Police Academy was established in the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Director J. Edgar Hoover, addressing the International Association of Chiefs of Police at their Forty-second annual Convention at Atlantic City, New Jersey, on July 9, 1935, said: "With the opening date set for July 29th and with the beginning to be made on a limited scale until we have passed the experimental state, the Attorney General hopes to provide in this Police Training School a *university of police methods* which may make the Bureau's most successful methods a part of the regulation police procedure in every part of the United States. Selected police officials from state and local units may here receive a complete three month's course of intensive study in the technique of modern law enforcement."¹⁸

By the beginning of this same year "well organized and equipped *in-service schools* were operating in the police departments of Wichita, Indianapolis, Cincinnati, Chicago, Berkeley, Louisville, San Francisco, New York City, and a few other cities".¹⁹

It was also in 1925 that representatives from the Peace Officers' Association of the State of

California contacted Mr. John C. Beswick, Chief of the Bureau of Trade and Industrial Education, State Department of Education, and he suggested a plan whereby state and federal funds might be used to establish a general police training program. In October, Mr. Beswick presented this plan to members of the Peace Officers' Association at their annual meeting in Marysville, California, and an advisory committee was appointed to work out the necessary details. The state advisory committee was composed of five men—the Honorable Earl Warren, then Attorney General of California, now Chief Justice of the United States, Sheriff Eugene Biscailuz, of Los Angeles County, Chief of Police William J. Quinn, of San Francisco, Clarence S. Morrill, Chief of the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation, and Mr. Beswick. "After its organization the committee during 1936 and 1937 held a series of conferences in fourteen zones into which the state had been divided." These conferences were "for the purpose of acquainting the sheriffs, district attorneys, chiefs of police, and other peace officers with the 'proposed' training program and also to demonstrate to these local officers teaching techniques and procedures used in vocational education."²⁰

The California Plan for Peace Officers' Training originally provided for the development of four types of training schools; the departmental training school, the zone training school, the summer school, or "Peace Officers' Technical Institutes", and the pre-employment training school. In conjunction with, or in addition to the four "schools" peace officers were given instruction in teacher training and training in leading conferences.²¹

Since 1946, two additional types of schools have been added: (1) The Basic Training School for Officers with less than three year's experience, which is operated in two locations, one at the Diablo Valley College in Northern California and one at the Riverside County Sheriff's Training Center in Southern California, and (2) The Peace Officers' Administrative Institute. "The Basic Training School program consists of a total of 218 hours, while the Administrative Institute is a

¹⁷ OUTLINE OF COURSE, POLICE SCHOOL, Mar. 9-14, 1931, Willamette University College of Law, Salem, Oregon.

¹⁸ J. EDGAR HOOVER, address to 42nd Annual Convention of IACP, July 8-11, 1935. PROCEEDINGS, p. 60.

¹⁹ V. A. LEONARD, POLICE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT, 1951, p. 138.

²⁰ G. H. BRERETON, The California Plan for Peace Officers' Training, JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY, Vol. 30, No. 3, Sept.-Oct., 1939, p. 371. Also see MUNICIPAL POLICE ADMINISTRATION op. cit., pp. 192-193.

²¹ G. H. BRERETON, op. cit., pp. 371-372.

three-day program for top-grade administrators or supervisors in law enforcement."²²

It should also be mentioned that "the passage of the George-Deen Act by Congress in 1936" added impetus, in some areas to law enforcement training. As a result of a request received from Chief L. V. Jenkins, Portland, Oregon, then President of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, a bulletin *Training for Police Service* was prepared and issued by the United States Office of Education. The first draft of this bulletin was prepared by O. D. Adams, Director of Vocational Education for the State of Oregon. Concerning the importance of training, the writers in *this* publication said: "Without in any way discounting the importance of the selection of personnel, the effects of the merit system, adequate salaries, and other items of personnel administration, it may fairly be stated that *an efficient police training program is one of the principal means for increasing and maintaining a high degree of efficiency in law enforcement work.*"²³

To close this part of my discussion concerning the development of law enforcement training during the first forty years of the twentieth century, it is apropos (of this meeting) to state that in September 1941 "the Department of Police Science and Administration was organized at Washington State College, Pullman, Washington . . . Under its Director, Dr. V. A. Leonard, the departments offers to qualified students who seek a career in the law enforcement field, four years of professional police training which lead to the Bachelor of Science Degree and gives full academic recognition to the professional requirement of the police service."²⁴

We have seen that by the beginning of the 1940's apparently great progress had been made in the education and training of law enforcement personnel. Starting at an early date, by 1928, many State Police had not only developed comparatively good training programs for their own personnel, but had also made available their facilities and instructors to local law enforcement agencies.

²² See California Program for Peace Officers' Training, State Department of Education, Bureau of Industrial Education, Sacramento, 1958 and Law Enforcement Training in California, Calif. Peace Officer Training Publication No. 72, Calif. State Dept. of Education, Sacramento, 1959.

²³ TRAINING FOR THE POLICE SERVICE, 1938, U. S. Dept. of Interior Office of Education, Voc. Div. Bulletin No. 197, p. 3. (Italics added.)

²⁴ V. A. LEONARD, POLICE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT, 1951, p. 429.

Individual police departments, in various areas throughout the country had developed their own training schools and "academies", at least some of which had good reputations. A few colleges and universities had become interested in providing either in-service, pre-employment, or both types of law enforcement training, to students, or to peace officers in their localities. The Federal Bureau of Investigation had developed its National Police Academy and was training officers selected from law enforcement agencies throughout the entire country. The United States Office of Education, as a result of liberalization of the law by Congress, was not only assisting, but encouraging the training of law enforcement officers by offering financial and teaching assistance through its vocational representatives, in various types of training programs. "Organized police training programs (had) been developed in many states on a statewide, zone, or local basis."²⁵

From what has been said it would appear that training peace officers was a "booming business", its need had been recognized, and the idea that it was necessary to have an intelligent, well educated, trained law enforcement officer, was universally accepted throughout the entire United States.²⁶ I am sorry to say that such is not the truth.

In spite of all of the effort which had been put forth by many law enforcement officials and educators; in spite of outstanding examples of the value of training and education to be found in a number of departments, colleges, and universities; in spite of the assistance and leadership offered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the United States Office of Education through its Vocational Division; in spite of the encouragement, information, and publicity, concerning the need for and benefits of law enforcement training disseminated by many national associations such as the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the International City Managers' Association, the American Municipal Association and numerous state associations of police, sheriffs,

²⁵ TRAINING FOR PUBLIC SERVICE OCCUPATIONS, United States Department of Interior, Office of Education 1937, Vocational Education, Bulletin No. 192, pp. 8-9.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 63 "In cooperation with state municipal leagues, instruction was given to police officers in Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Minnesota, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin."

district attorneys, etc.; in spite of the books, the many articles and reports which had been written concerning the subject—in 1949 Bruce Smith wrote that “even the most casual observer of police training facilities must be impressed by their confused relationship and by the chaotic disturbances which afflict them at frequent intervals. Even today, entire states are without a single police training unit worthy of the name, and others with police schools conducted on such a casual basis, and for such brief and uncertain periods as to have little influence in raising the general level of police service. In most instances, the fault lies in the fact that small forces cannot support training facilities of any kind, and that even in some of the larger police establishments recruits are inducted at irregular and unpredictable intervals.”²⁷

In the same year that Bruce Smith's book was published, August Vollmer wrote, concerning police training: “The number of hours spent in training recruits will vary, of course, from city to city. In some communities a few days field work under the supervision of an older officer or sergeant may be all the preliminary training that the neophyte will receive before he is thrust upon the public as a fully prepared official capable of handling all of the problems that require police attention, on the other hand three months intensive training is the rule in some cities.”²⁸

“There is a persistent but false belief, shared by the public and the police, that practical experience gained in the traditional procedure sufficiently enables the policeman to deal with all of the crime and the behavior problems that are presented to the police for solution. It will suffice to say that this erroneous idea has postponed the day when *professional standards will be established for entrance into the police service.*”²⁹

With reference to *pre-service* training by police, Vollmer, in 1949 selected Washington State College, Michigan State College, San Jose State and Fresno State Colleges in California, the University of California at Berkeley, and the University of Indiana, as “trail-blazing” institutions which “will probably be followed by others when the public becomes fully conscious of the values to be derived from a socialized and professionalized police service. . . . One of the by-products of police

pre-service training, is the opportunity that it affords to eliminate, during the school period, those candidates who may be morally, mentally, physically, or temperamentally unsuited for police work.”³⁰

“What is sorely needed in this country are Schools of Criminology with curricula suited to the requirements of students who intend to prepare for entry into one of the several branches of law enforcement. Because there is a dearth of factual material to guide them in their decisions, legislators should insist that state-supported colleges must create Schools of Criminology. . . . When graduates in sufficient number become available, the lawmakers should enact legislation which would establish *professional standards* for entrance into every branch of law enforcement.”³¹

Two years after August Vollmer made his more recent observations and recommendations concerning the need for establishing *college training* of law enforcement officers, and state legislation which would establish professional standards for law enforcement officers, Dr. V. A. Leonard, Chairman of the Washington State College, Department of Police Science, also emphasized “the need for the establishment of professional curricula in universities and colleges affording specific training of men and women for entry into this strategic branch of the public service” and stated that “. . . police entrance standards must provide for the selection of men possessing a superior degree of intelligence in order to assure satisfactory performance in positions to which the candidate may advance later.”³²

With reference to *in-service training* and regional in-service training schools, Leonard, although naming a number of colleges and universities “who have made notable contribution to the organization of in-service training facilities on a zone or regional basis”, said, “in general, however, regional in-service training schools have *not* measured up to the results anticipated by their sponsors and their failure to meet the training needs of the police becomes increasingly manifest. The short sessions of from three days to three months are inadequate.”³³

“In-service training was never intended nor can it be expected to train a man professionally

²⁷ Ibid., p. 373.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 373.

²⁹ V. A. LEONARD, POLICE ORGANIZATION & MANAGEMENT, 1951, pp. 108-109.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 148.

²⁷ BRUCE SMITH, POLICE SYSTEMS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1949, p. 296.

²⁸ AUGUST VOLLMER, THE CRIMINAL, 1949, p. 354.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 365. (Italics added.)

for a given field . . . the position of the police is that of a profession, it is not a trade. The basic function of in-service training is to help professionally trained men keep abreast of new developments in the field. To expect more is to court failure."³⁴

Basically, Dr. Leonard's statements with reference to in-service training are correct, particularly concerning its primary objectives of upgrading, or presenting specialized or refresher courses to personnel who are assumed to have had basic law enforcement training. However, we cannot overlook the fact that in the absence of mandatory requirements that *all* law enforcement officers complete an adequate *pre-service training* program, prior to employment in law enforcement agencies, *in-service training* no matter how abbreviated, does some good, and a well planned and organized in-service training program is not only valuable, but necessary. In addition to these facts it is believed that geographic expansion of in-service training, has had, and will continue to have a very important effect upon the acceleration and the demand for pre-service law enforcement training.³⁵

On the other hand, supporting the belief that in-service training is only a "stop-gap" until we reach the ultimate goal of universal college *pre-service law enforcement training and certification* before employment, Charles F. Sloane, former New York State Trooper, has said that "the attempts made to train our police in in-service training schools, held sporadically with sessions of two to three hours a day for several days, with attendance at the sessions the only criteria for receiving diplomas, is a totally inadequate method of teaching police work. . . . In-service training schools staffed with competent instructors *can* be of value to police departments in imparting various skills and knowledges to men *after* proper indoctrination into the police field via full-time, comprehensive recruit training schools, *if* proper safeguards are maintained at such sessions and

diplomas awarded only to those candidates who successfully pass written examinations."³⁶

"The only reasonable solution to the problem of training recruits, is for the various states to create training schools for police conducted by each state and manned by competent instructor personnel drawn from police departments, colleges and private industry."³⁷

I am sure that no one will disagree that J. Edgar Hoover, from the time of his appointment in 1924 as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, until the present, has been an outstanding leader in the professionalization of law enforcement and in the field of training. In an interview in 1954 he had this to say relative to its importance: "The efficiency of law enforcement today is commensurate with the degree of training of its officers. Only through modern police training can we keep abreast of the times in the unceasing fight against lawlessness . . . police work by untrained men . . . is as obsolete as the practice of medicine by sorcery".³⁸

"Although the FBI is a federal law enforcement agency concerned only with the investigation of crimes coming under its jurisdiction . . . *the idealism, the ability, the selection, the training, the leadership, the integrity, and the education* of the Director and his Special Agents has been an inspiration to every sincere law enforcement officer who has striven or who is striving for the same goals in his own organization and has made a lasting impression upon both the police service and the public citizen."³⁹

NEED FOR "PROFESSIONALS" IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

During the *sixty-year* period under consideration we have seen a gradual but generally increasing interest in and development of law enforcement training. Although this has not been constant, and from time to time, as indicated by various writers of the period, it has temporarily

³⁴ CHARLES F. SLOANE, *State Academies for Police*, JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW, CRIMINOLOGY & POLICE SCIENCE, Vol. 45, No. 6, Mar.-Apr., 1955, p. 730.

³⁷ Ibid. pp. 730-731; and A. F. BRANDSTETTER, Director, School of Police Administration and Public Safety, Michigan State College, Michigan's Answer to Its Law Enforcement Training Needs, THE POLICE YEAR BOOK, IACP, 1958, p. 35.

³⁸ ALBERT DEUTSCH, *Is Your Police Force Obsolete?* COLLIER, October 1, 1954.

³⁹ GEORGE H. BRERETON, *Police Work Is A Profession*, CALIFORNIA PEACE OFFICER, Jan.-Feb., 1955, Vol. 5, No. 3, p. 24.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 150.

³⁶ See FRANK M. BOOLSEN, *DIRECTORY OF UNIVERSITY & COLLEGE CRIMINOLOGY PROGRAMS*, 1950 and A. C. GERMANN, *Law Enforcement, Education & Training in the United States*, THE POLICE CHIEF, Oct. 1957, pp. 22, 24, 26, 28, also see G. DOUGLAS GOURLEY, *In-Service Training of Policemen by University & Colleges*, THE JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW, CRIMINOLOGY & POLICE SCIENCE, Vol. 44, No. 2, July-Aug. 1952, pp. 220-340, incl.

declined in some areas and in certain departments, particularly during the past twenty years, and more so in the last *ten* years, "slowly but with increasing emphasis and momentum, the movement is growing to elevate educational requirements for the law enforcement vocation".⁴⁰

Influenced in no small degree by the persons whom I have previously mentioned and other police administrators, educators, and writers, and by the activities and/or the reports of associations and crime investigation committees, the goal established today, by a great many leaders in the field of law enforcement, is *complete professionalization* of the law enforcement service.

Although a few individuals, recognized at an early date that the demands placed on law enforcement and the variety of the duties and knowledge required of its officers, seemed to indicate the eventual requirement that all officers would have a college education in law enforcement prior to their employment,⁴¹ it has only been in comparatively *recent* years that so many law enforcement officials and educators are in agreement that law enforcement *is*, or should be, a profession, and that in order to attain such status it is necessary that the education and training of the law enforcement officer be comparable to that required of a number of other "professions". "Certainly", says Dr. Germann, "a four-year technical education is not necessary for a young man who wishes a law enforcement career at the patrolman level, and who will pursue it according to traditional fashion . . . It is the broad education of the police officer that is important as long as police leadership is 'up from the ranks'".⁴²

Although there are, no doubt, many writers whose thoughts concerning professionalization have not come to my attention, there are a few statements written in recent years, particularly during and since 1954, which are worth repeating.

In *Municipal Police Administration*, published in 1954 by the International City Managers'

Association, we find the following statement: "Police work today is approaching the status of a profession. While it may be years before this objective is achieved the *educational preparation and on-the-job training of police officers will materially contribute to it*".⁴³ In a subsequent section the writer also says "...advanced in-service law enforcement training such as that at the University of Southern California, *holds great promise for ultimate professionalization of police service*".⁴⁴

Albert Deutsch writing in the October 1, 1954 issue of *Collier's Magazine*, although extremely critical of law enforcement training in many police departments, said: "The whole professionalizing process presages a period, not distant when the policeman, the keeper of the peace, will possess the dignified and rewarding status long withheld from an honorable public vocation . . . with the lag in training, it is remarkable that so many men and women of professional caliber are already in police work".⁴⁵

However, taking sharp issue with "the writings of so many 'police experts' that members of police forces are now either on the verge of entering the 'police profession', or have already entered through an open door and are accepted as professional men . . . that the *only* method by which police work, in its entirety, can ever hope to attain the status of a profession is to squarely face the facts concerned therein, set the goal and then, step by step, eliminate the obstacles confronting them".⁴⁶ Sloane points out the fact that although the "...professions all require a minimum of four years of college . . . the minimum requirements in the police field today (1954) vary . . . from 'graduation from high school' to as low as ability to read and write the English language".⁴⁷

Granted that there *is* a low, and a wide range in minimum educational requirements for entrance to the law enforcement profession, and that there are difficult obstacles, such as *residential restrictions, apathy, fear of being supplanted, jealousy of another's accomplishments, and desire for political control or patronage to overcome*, it was not too many years ago that the only requirement for practicing the profession of law was to hang out one's shingle!

⁴⁰ A. C. GERMANN, *Law Enforcement Education*, op. cit., p. 22.

⁴¹ MRS. JOHN P. BUALDA, Director of the 1st Institute of Police Administration at Riverside, California 1929, said: "It is an amazing thing that we maintain Annapolis and West Point to train officers against a possible foreign aggressor and that we have no comparable training for our officers in the war against crime, which is a constant thing, costing infinitely more." Proceedings of the 1st Institute of Police Administration, No. 12-13, 1929, in *Occasional Papers of Riverside Jr., College*, Vol. 5, No. 1, March 1930, p. 41.

⁴² A. C. GERMANN, op. cit., p. 22.

⁴³ Op. cit., p. 187. (Italics added.)

⁴⁴ Ibid. p. 78. (Italics added.)

⁴⁵ ALBERT DEUTSCH, op. cit.

⁴⁶ CHARLES F. SLOANE, *Police Professionalization*, *JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW, CRIMINOLOGY AND POLICE SCIENCE*, Vol. 45, No. 1, May-June 1954, pp. 77-78.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 78.

Dr. Germann, who received his police experience in the Los Angeles Police Department, names "...some twenty professional groups, including law, medicine, engineering, architecture, teaching, veterinary medicine, pharmacy, etc. . . which have set minimum academic requirements . . . to improve the quality and economic status of their practitioners in order to protect the public, and in order to enhance their professional status . . . the police service well-deserves the dignity and status that such accredited programs give". "It is interesting to note . . . that in the State of Michigan the profession of pharmacy has progressed in 30 years from NO educational requirements to a *SIX YEAR* training requirement."⁴⁸

Chief of Police Fred Hess, of Bloomfield, New Jersey, agreed in 1957 that "Police service may well not be considered as a profession until such time as well developed training programs are provided for the police that are comparable to those that prepare persons for the recognized professions".⁴⁹ But Chief Benard C. Brannon, of Kansas City, Missouri, in the same year said: "We all know that the demands upon the policeman are so varied and great that his work has ascended to a true professional calling of its own, one that matches any of the honorable professions in the need for exceptional study and training requisites for membership . . . The policeman did not create this new profession; it was thrust upon him. Proof that he did not create the new profession is that in large measure he does not, and is not prepared to discharge the duties of his office. This is not to disparage our current efforts, but is only a frank acknowledgement of the existence of a taxing and challenging profession without sufficient professional people to practice it".⁵⁰ "The combination of two factors is necessary for our professional success: (1) We must create the desire on the part of young people to study policing, (2) we must persuade our colleges and universities to establish law enforcement curriculums and assist them in their endeavors."⁵¹

Inspector H. Ashenhurst, of the Dallas, Texas, Police Department says: "If we analyze the pro-

fessions we find that a first requirement is training . . . the second requirement to be met before entering a profession is a license or certificate based on standards of competence . . . this is where we run into a major difficulty in the police profession. . . . The third requirement is one which is within our grasp, we need a Code of Ethics accepted by all members of our profession . . . we need some means of seeing that this code is not violated . . . we have a Code of Ethics adopted by the IACP, by the National Conference of Police Associations and by hundreds of others . . . It can be adopted by every police department. It can be enforced by each chief of police."⁵²

In California, for many years, we have promoted the upgrading of officers by training, as well as through other means. In making this statement, I do not wish to imply that similar activities have not been taking place in other states, nor that *we* have reached the goal which has been indicated by Inspector Ashenhurst. We *do* have the same Code of Ethics to which he referred, but I cannot say whether or not it has been adopted by each of our 362 police departments. It *has* been adopted by some of them and has been adopted by our State Peace Officers' and our State Sheriffs' Associations.

In training we have made great progress, both in the in-service and pre-service fields. However, it should be realized that there is still a difficult uphill road to travel before officers will be required to possess a certificate to practice the profession of law enforcement as is now required of those persons in other professions. Although many of our law enforcement agencies *do* require a minimum education of graduation from high school, or its equivalent, and a few give credit for additional education, we are still a long way from the goal of a college diploma.

In recent years much thought, discussion, and attention has been given to the establishment of minimum standards for our California law enforcement officers. Particularly through the efforts of the Peace Officers' Research Association of California, and the Peace Officers' Association of the State of California, an attempt was made, starting in 1954, to establish a "Professional Law Enforcement Act" within the Business and Professional Code of California which would have

⁴⁸ A. C. GERMANN, op. cit., p. 24.

⁴⁹ FRED HESS, *Police Training in Small Communities*, JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW, CRIMINOLOGY AND POLICE SCIENCE, Vol. 49, No. 1, p. 75.

⁵⁰ BENARD C. BRANNON, *Into Tomorrow*, (address to 64th Annual Convention IACP, Honolulu, 1957) THE POLICE YEAR BOOK, 1958, p. 26.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 28.

⁵² PAUL H. ASHENHURST, *The Goal: A Police Profession*, JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY AND POLICE SCIENCE, Vol. 49, No. 6, Mar.-April, 1959, pp. 605-607.

established minimum standards and provided a certificate or license for the law enforcement officer who could meet these standards. A "Minimum Standards Bill", which was prepared and introduced in the 1957 session of the State Legislature was defeated by the League of California Cities and the State Supervisors' Association because of its mandatory provisions pertaining to police and sheriffs' departments and alleged interference with "home rule". However, in the 1959 regular session a California Peace Officers' Standards and Training Act, (Chapter 1823, Statutes, 1959, Penal Code Sec. 13500-13523) was passed by the Legislature, with the support and assistance of the League of California Cities, since cities and counties are not *required* to participate in the program, but may do so on an optional basis.

This Act established a Peace Officers' Training Fund, the money for which comes from 5% assessment on all fines collected by California courts for criminal offenses, except fines collected for traffic or fish and game violations. The fund, which is administered by a Commission of nine members and an Executive Secretary, is to be used for training purposes, under rules established by the commission. This program, although just getting started, appears to offer considerable promise that law enforcement will receive increased upgrading in the near future.

To close this discussion I shall outline the requirements which are apparently necessary if law enforcement is to achieve *recognition as a profession*.

1. Satisfactory completion of a four-year college course in law enforcement training, leading to a Bachelor's Degree. (Physical,

mental and other types of screening should take place here.)

2. Possession of a certificate, issued upon state authority by a Board or Commission, based upon an examination, attesting to the fact that the applicant is qualified and is trained in law enforcement.
3. Elimination of all local residence requirements within a state for employment of such "qualified" personnel. (Residence requirements are outmoded, and in a number of our largest police departments in California, i.e., Los Angeles, San Francisco and San Diego, are no longer required of an applicant for employment.)
4. Establishment of the requirement, when sufficient "certificated" recruits are available, (which should include not only the minimum education but also the experience required for the particular position) by all towns, cities, and counties, that all persons who are to be employed in law enforcement be trained and in supervisory positions, be trained as indicated in #1.
5. Development of a professional "career" class of law enforcement officers receiving salaries, retirement and other benefits which are commensurate with the education, duties, and responsibilities demanded of the profession. (Opportunities for advancement in the police field should be just as available to capable police administrators, as they are to penologists, city managers, engineers, finance officers, educators, and many others in the public service.)